

REMARKS


The rejection of elected claims 1-2 and 5-6 under 35 USC 102 for anticipation by the cited Lee patent is traversed by the coil of claims 1 and 5 wound in a space inside two extended parts and in a space 33e between the two extended parts as shown in Fig. 2 and described in the paragraph bridging pages 9 and 10 of the specification, for example. Fig. 3 of the patent shows no such coil between extended parts, and the patent describes none.

As claims can be rejected for anticipation only if the claimed invention is found in the reference, and it is not in this case, the rejection is traversed, which is not surprising, since the patent is also the applicant's.

The rejection for anticipation should not be converted into one for obviousness, because the claimed difference of that additional "between" coil increases the magnetic flux. No way of doing this is disclosed or suggested in the patent.

Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William R. Evans
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023
Reg. No. 25858
Tel. No. (212) 708-1930